

REMARKS

Applicant's undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner and his Supervisor, Mr. John B. Walsh, for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded during an interview conducted by telephone on March 8, 2006. During the interview, it was agreed that Greenstein was unrelated to network communications, and that the USPTO would withdraw reliance on Greenstein as a reference against the claims.

During the interview, the undersigned also explained that some language in independent Claims 1 and 40 might be seen as inconsistent with some embodiments of the invention and with some of the dependent claims. Accordingly, it was explained that this Supplemental Preliminary Amendment would be filed, in which the following phrase was deleted from each of independent Claims 1 and 40:

"wherein the reconfiguration event is transmitted over the network by the one multifunction network device via its network interface and is received via the network".

It is not believed that this deletion affects the general analysis or arguments in support of patentability. Naturally, however, since the deleted language no longer forms part of the claims, no patentable weight should be accorded to the deleted language, and the public may not rely on this language in determining the scope and content of the claims.

An action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 110494v1